

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

**Kremmling Field Office
P O Box 68
Kremmling, CO 80459**

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

NUMBER: DOI-BLM-CON02000-2013-0024-EA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: N/A

PROJECT NAME: Radium Boat Launch Maintenance

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T. 1 S., R. 82 W., Sec 27, 6th P.M.

APPLICANT: Bureau of Land Management, Kremmling Field Office

PURPOSE & NEED FOR THE ACTION:

During high flow years, sediment builds up in the channel of the Colorado River leading to the boat ramp at the Radium Boat Launch. During low water years boats cannot access the ramp because there is no water flowing near the ramp. Over the past 14 years, since the ramp was expanded, gravel from the bottom of the existing boat ramp has been washed away creating a drop-off of about two feet. Sediment needs to be removed from the gravel bar and redeposited at the end of the boat ramp.

Decision to be Made: Should BLM remove the gravel on the sand bar and redeposit it at the bottom of the existing Radium boat ramp so as to remove the two foot drop off and prevent boaters from getting stuck on the gravel bar and not being able to guide the boats to the take out.

SCOPING, PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AND ISSUES:

Date	ID Team Members Present	Issues/Comments Brought Forth
3/1/2013	Sent email to all BLM KFO ID team	N/A
3/4/2013	Tom Adamson (Forester), Ken Belcher (Forester), Paul Belcher (Hydrology), Susan Cassel (Associate Field Manager), Kelly Elliott (Minerals), Cookie Landing (Range), Megan McGuire (Wildlife Biologist), John Monkouski (Recreation), Hannah Schechter (recreation), Kevin Thompson (Fire), Bill Wyatt	None

	(Archeology)	
--	--------------	--

External scoping: was conducted by posting this project on the KFO's on-line National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) register on 05/02/2013.

Date	Persons/Agencies/Media Contacted
3/21/13	Scoping letter sent to: Colorado Parks and Wildlife, Trout Unlimited, Wild & Scenic Stakeholder Group, Grand County Commissioners, Eagle County Commissioners, 2012/2013 Permitted Commercial Outfitters on Upper Colorado River (Confluence to State Bridge), Mountain Buzz, Denver Post, Ski Hi Daily, Grand Gazette, Vail Daily, Eagle Valley Enterprise, Grand Junction Sentinel, Citizen Telegram, Post Independent, Sopri Sun, Tamarisk Coalition, Colorado Canyon Association, Senator Mark Udall, Michael Leroux, Joe Kelso, Julie Bambei, Pepper Etters, Randall & Silvia Hayes, Leroux Land & Cattle LLC, Roger & Diana Harris, Bruce & Mary Lou Yeik, Carl & Elizabeth Rahne, Edwin Rumpf
3/21/13	Published in the Vail Daily
3/21/2013	Twittered on Aurora News Network
3/22/2013	Published in Summit County Citizens Voice
3/28/2013	Published in the Grand Gazette
3/29/2013	Published in the Ski-Hi News
4/3/2013	Published in the Denver Post

Issues: Mike Leroux had one comment about the maintenance: I have a number of concerns about the project including: Will the establishment of a different river corridor and its respecting effect on my property directly across the river from the site a) will the diversion change the water flow and depth at my pump location and b) will the diversion change the stream flow adjacent to my current property boundary?

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

Background/Introduction:

Proposed Action: BLM is also proposing to maintain the existing ramp by removing the sandbar of accumulated sediment out of the channel leading to the boat ramp and use those materials to build up the river bed at the existing ramp. This work would be completed by a private contractor. This type of maintenance would be periodically needed in the future to keep the existing boat ramp accessible to floatboating and float fishing while reducing the drop-off at the bottom of the ramp.

Design Features:

- BLM personnel would be present at the boat ramp area to direct visitors where they can safely launch or take-out from the river corridor.
- Signage identifying that heavy equipment and maintenance of the boat launch area would be posted at the entrance of the Radium Developed Recreation Area.

- Using the front edge of the deposit or a coffer dam to keep most of the river away from the boat ramp's channel will help decrease the construction's disturbed sediment from reaching the main channel.

No Action Alternative: The gravel bar would not be repaired and therefore, the existing boat launch will continue to have a drop off making it very difficult in low water to reach the take out especially by inexperienced rafters.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT CARRIED FORWARD: None

PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The Proposed Action is subject to and has been reviewed for conformance with the following plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM 1617.3):

Name of Plan: Record of Decision for the Kremmling Resource Management Plan

Date Approved: 1984 and updated in 1999

Decision Number/Page: Decision Number II B 7a/page 9

Decision Language: "...ensuring the continued availability of outdoor recreational opportunities which the public seeks and which are not readily available from other sources, to reduce the impacts of recreational use on fragile and unique resource values, and to provide for visitor safety, and resource interpretation."

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Standards for Public Land Health: In January 1997, the Colorado BLM approved the Standards for Public Land Health. These standards cover upland soils, riparian systems, plant and animal communities, special status species, and water quality. Standards describe conditions needed to sustain public land health and relate to all uses of the public lands. Because a standard exists for these five categories, a finding must be made for each of them in an environmental analysis (EA). These findings are located in specific elements listed below.

Cumulative Effects Analysis Assumptions: Cumulative effects are defined in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR 1508.7) as "...the impact on the environment that results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions." Table 1 lists the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions within the area that might be affected by the Proposed Action; for this project the area considered was the Upper Colorado River SRMA from However, the geographic scope used for analysis may vary for each cumulative effects issue and is described in the Affected Environment section for each resource.

Table 1. Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions

Action Description	STATUS		
	Past	Present	Future
Livestock Grazing	X		
Recreation	X	X	X
Invasive Weed Inventory and Treatments	X	X	X
Spring or Water Developments	X		X
Wildfire and Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation	X	X	X
Wind Energy Met Towers			X
Oil and Gas Development: Well Pads Access Roads Pipelines Gas Plants Facilities			
Power Lines	X	X	X
Oil Shale			
Seismic			
Vegetation Treatments	X	X	X

Affected Resources:

The CEQ Regulations state that NEPA documents “must concentrate on the issues that are truly significant to the action in question, rather than amassing needless detail” (40 CFR 1500.1(b)). While many issues may arise during scoping, not all of the issues raised warrant analysis in an environmental assessment (EA). Issues will be analyzed if: 1) an analysis of the issue is necessary to make a reasoned choice between alternatives, or 2) if the issue is associated with a significant direct, indirect, or cumulative impact, or where analysis is necessary to determine the significance of the impacts. Table 2 lists the resources considered and the determination as to whether they require additional analysis.

Table 2. Resources and Determination of Need for Further Analysis

Determination ¹	Resource	Rationale for Determination
Physical Resources		
NI	Air Quality	There would be no impact to air quality from implementing either the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative.
NI	Geology and Minerals	There would be no impact to geological or mineral resources from implementing either the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative.
NI	Soil Resources*	The Proposed Action will remove sediment/gravel accumulated at the mouth of the river channel and use it to repair the existing boat ramp. The work is entirely within the existing channel and will not affect upland soils.
PI	Surface and Ground Water Quality*	See Surface and Ground Water Quality Section of this environmental analysis
Biological Resources		

Determination ¹	Resource	Rationale for Determination
NI	Wetlands and Riparian Zones*	The Proposed Action is located in the river and at the existing boat ramp, where the riparian vegetation has been cleared in the past. There would be no new disturbance to the vegetated streambanks or impacts to the riparian area. Under the No Action Alternative, some riparian vegetation could be impacted. Areas on either side of the ramp would be used during all but the highest flows to avoid the boat ramp's drop-off. Depending on the volume of users, vegetated banks could start being disturbed and eventually vegetation removed, exposing more bare ground to larger flows and reducing riparian habitat.
NI	Vegetation*	There would be no impact to vegetation resources from implementing either the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative.
NI	Invasive, Non-native Species	There would be no impact to invasive, non-native species from implementing either the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative.
PI	Special Status Animal Species*	See Special Status Animal and Plant Species analysis.
PI	Special Status Plant Species*	See Special Status Animal and Plant Species analysis.
NI	Migratory Birds	There would be no impact to migratory birds from implementing either the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative.
PI	Aquatic Wildlife*	See Aquatic wildlife analysis.
NI	Terrestrial Wildlife*	There would be no impact to terrestrial wildlife from implementing either the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative.
Heritage Resources and the Human Environment		
NI	Cultural Resources	Two cultural resource inventories CR-12-08 and CR-13-22 were conducted for the Proposed Action. No cultural resources were located. The project is a no effect , there are no historic properties that would be affected.
NI	Paleontological Resources	Because the Proposed Action is located along the Colorado River Edge and on an old sand bar it is highly unlikely that fossil remains would be encountered. The project should be monitored during the construction for potential fossils. BLM standard "discovery" stipulation is part of the environmental assessment and is to be attached to any authorization allowing the project to proceed.
NI	Native American Religious Concerns	Tribal consultation for the project has been initiated on February 17, 2011, and on December 10, 2012. To date no American Indian Tribe has identified any area of traditional cultural or spiritual concern.
NI	Visual Resources	There would be no impact to visual resources from implementing either the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative.
NI	Noise	The proposed action is short term duration and would occur within an area with existing noise from the adjacent railroad and County Road. No impacts from the proposed action or the no action alternative.
NI	Hazardous or Solid Wastes	There are no quantities of wastes, hazardous or solid, located on BLM-administered lands in the proposed project area, and there would be no wastes generated as a result of the Proposed Action or No Action alternative.
NI	Fire Management	The proposed action will have minimal to no impact on Fire Management.

Determination¹	Resource	Rationale for Determination
NI	Social and Economic Conditions	There would not be any substantial changes to local social or economic conditions.
NP	Environmental Justice	According to the most recent Economic Census Bureau statistics (2009), there are minority and low income communities within the Kremmling Planning Area. There would be no direct impacts to these populations.
NI	Cadastral	This is an existing BLM project.
Resource Uses		
NP	Forest Management	Forest resources are not present in the project area.
NP	Rangeland Management	There are no existing livestock grazing allotments in the proposed area.
PI	Floodplains, Hydrology, and Water Rights	See the discussion within this environmental analysis.
NP	Realty Authorizations	There are no right-of-ways authorized in the proposed project area.
PI	Recreation	See the recreation analysis.
NI	Access and Transportation	The proposed action is short term duration and access along and to and from the river for floatboating would still be permitted adjacent to the boat ramp. Maintenance of the existing boat ramp area will improve access and transportation for floatboating opportunities. Visitors accessing the area for fishing opportunities typically are along the banks of the river and would only be displaced where the equipment is being used for maintenance operations. BLM personnel will be onsite to direct those launching or taking out from the boat ramp area ensuring public safety. Under the no action alternative the boat ramp would not be maintained and access to the river utilizing the ramp would not be improved. There are no impacts from the proposed or no action alternatives.
NP	Prime and Unique Farmlands	There are no Prime and Unique Farmlands within the project area.
Special Designations		
NP	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	No Areas of Critical Environmental Concern are present in the project area.
NP	Wilderness and Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	There are no Wilderness, Wilderness Study Areas or Lands with Wilderness Characteristics within the project area.
NP	Wild and Scenic Rivers	The Proposed Action would not impact the ORVs, free flowing character, or tentative classification (i.e., Recreational) of the eligible section of the Colorado River since the construction activities would occur in a developed recreation site. The No Action Alternative would have no impact to Wild and Scenic Rivers.
NP	Scenic Byways	There are no Scenic Byways within the project area.

¹ NP = Not present in the area impacted by the Proposed Action or Alternatives. NI = Present, but not affected to a degree that detailed analysis is required. PI = Present with potential for impact analyzed in detail in the EA.

* Public Land Health Standard

SURFACE & GROUND WATER QUALITY

Affected Environment: The proposed action is located on the Colorado River. This segment of the river is designated for aquatic life- coldwater 1, recreation E (primary contact recreation exists), water supply, and agriculture. There are no known or suspected water quality impairments in this segment of the river. The BLM monitors water temperature upstream of the ramp near the county bridge. The sensor records water temperatures during the field season (May-October) at fifteen minute intervals. Every two weeks, the BLM downloads the sensor data and takes field water quality parameters at the site. Temperature monitoring is especially important to the aquatic life in the river. Upstream diversions, drought, and warm summer temperatures can raise the nighttime water temperatures, which can be stressful to coldwater species such as trout.

To date, the sensor tends to be similar to the sensor at the Pumphouse site, which has been in place since 2007. Despite low river flows and warm air temperatures, this portion of the river generally meets the state's temperature standard for aquatic life. In 2012, the highest recorded temperature was 19.15° C, which is well below the acute daily limit of 22.4 C. The seven day chronic temperature standard, reflected in the MWAT (maximum weekly average temperature) of 17° C was exceeded July 14th. The average and median temperatures recorded in 2012 were both 15.7 C, reflecting the warm summer.

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act requires dredge and fill activities in wetlands and below the high water line to obtain a permit. The Proposed Action is permitted under the Nationwide Permit #3 for Maintenance. The permit allows for the "repair, rehabilitation of any previously authorized, currently serviceable structure, or fill. Any stream channel modification is limited to the minimum necessary for the repair, rehabilitation, or replacement of the structure or fill; such modifications, including the removal of material from the stream channel, must be immediately adjacent to the project." It also authorizes flood damaged structures, provided the work occurs within two years of the flood. It authorizes the removal of accumulated sediments within 200 feet of the structure and allows for the placement of new or additional material to protect the structure. The existing boat ramp was authorized by the Army Corps of Engineers in 1999.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:

Direct and Indirect Effects: Groundwater quality would not be affected by the Proposed Action or the No Action Alternative. The Proposed Action could be completed in a fairly short time period, less than two days. As the equipment scoops up the gravel deposit, embedded fines and sediments would be released to the river, resulting in increased turbidity. Due to the low flow of the river (around 500-550 cfs), the river separates into two channels just above the gravel deposit. Most of the disturbance will occur along the "minor" or smaller channel that passes in front of the ramp. The increased sediment load would have some time to redeposit prior to reaching the main channel, but there would still be a sediment plume returning to the main channel below the ramp. Using the front edge of the deposit or a coffer dam to keep most of the river away from the boat ramp's channel would help decrease the construction's disturbed sediment from reaching the main channel. Minimizing the trips equipment make to the deposit, minimizing the time equipment is in the river, and not disturbing previously disturbed areas will help reduce the amount of released sediment.

Cumulative Effects: The amount and duration of the disturbance would not result in a measurable increase of sediment. Completing the project during low flows results in a higher concentration (less dilution) of sediment, but is the optimum time to do structure repair. Overall, the increased sediment would only last for a very short time after the repair work is completed and would not measurably affect water quality in the river.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:

Direct and Indirect Effects: Under the No Action Alternative, the river would continue to erode the material at the end of the boat ramp, depending on streamflows. Water quality would basically be unaffected.

Cumulative Effects: None

Mitigation: None

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard #5 for Water Quality: The affected segment of the Colorado River is considered to be meeting the Water Quality standard. The Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative would not affect the river's ability to continue to meet the standard.

SPECIAL STATUS PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES

Affected Environment: A list of threatened, endangered, and candidate species which could inhabit the area was received from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on March 18, 2011 and verified online April 25, 2013. Analysis of this list indicated that no listed species would be affected by the proposed project.

Bald eagles, recently delisted from threatened status, are yearlong residents of the Colorado River corridor in the proposed project area.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:

Direct and Indirect Effects: No active bald eagle nests are located near the proposed project and the project would not remove any bald eagle habitat features such as roost or perch trees, nor would construction activities impact river habitat. Thus, the project is not likely to impact bald eagles.

Cumulative Effects: None

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:

Direct and Indirect Effects: As there are no active bald eagle nests located near the proposed project, there would be no impacts from the No Action Alternative

Cumulative Effects: None

Mitigation: None

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard #4 for Special Status Species: The proposed project area has not been assessed for compliance with the Standards for Land Health in Colorado, however the proposed project is not expected to impact Standard 4.

AQUATIC WILDLIFE

Affected Environment: The proposed project is adjacent to the Colorado River, which supports an abundant amount of aquatic wildlife, coldwater fish, ducks, geese, beavers, river otters, and muskrats.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:

Direct and Indirect Effects: Sufficient habitat exists both upstream and downstream the Colorado River to support wildlife displaced by the activities associated with the proposed project. Disturbance of the streambed and increased sediment in the stream are expected impacts of the Proposed Action. This could negatively affect fish spawning and reduce habitat quality. Equipment would be staged on the boat ramp and in the side channel, below the normal high water line. The work is proposed to be done in the early spring when river flows are very low, and most of the flow would be away from the work and in the main channel. This helps reduce sediment loading into the river. The proposed construction period is during the rainbow trout spawning period. Rainbow trout spawn in gravels and stream riffles, and could be disturbed by the removal of the gravel bar. The Kremmling Field Office consulted with the BLM's West Slope fishery biologist and the Colorado Parks & Wildlife fishery biologist regarding the timing of the project. The proposed action would only impact one year of rainbow trout spawning, in a very small localized area. It is likely that the current gravel bar is repeatedly disturbed during low flows by rafts scraping across the gravel bar anyway. The removal of the gravel for the boat ramp maintenance is considered to be too small of an area to measurably impact the Colorado River's rainbow trout population.

Cumulative Effects: None.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:

Direct and Indirect Effects: Under the No Action alternative, the existing conditions are expected to continue. The rainbow eggs could continue to be impacted by the boats scraping the gravel deposit.

Cumulative Effects: None.

Mitigation: None.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard #3 for Plant and Animal Communities: The proposed project area has not been assessed for compliance with the Standards for Land Health in Colorado, however the proposed project is not expected to impact Standard 3.

FLOODPLAINS, HYDROLOGY, AND WATER RIGHTS

Affected Environment: The proposed action is located along the Colorado River floodplain. The toe of the boat ramp extends into the river under normal flow conditions. The existing boat ramp is located on the outside curve of the river. Under low flow conditions, there is a sandbar upstream from the ramp that juts out into the river, and a mid-channel gravel deposit directly across from the boat ramp. A portion of the river flows between these two deposits, and it is there that the 2011 floods built up a channel deposit that is proposed for removal. It appears that the river is migrating away from the boat ramp, moving the thalweg (the deepest part of the channel) to outside the mid channel gravel deposit.

On the opposite side of the river is private property owned by Mr. Leroux. A hay meadow of approximately 50 acres is irrigated by a portable pump that draws directly out of the river. Mr. Leroux holds a 2.0 cfs absolute water right for the irrigation. The water right, water case W3430 was filed in July of 1977, and has an appropriation date of June 6, 1977. Mr. Leroux generally diverts 1 cfs, and since 1993, has six years of use. The last time the right was used was in 2009, although the water right would have allowed diversion in 2010-2012.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:

Direct and Indirect Effects: The Proposed Action does not affect the functionality of the floodplain, nor does it affect the flood hazards along the river. It would temporarily return the stream channel dimensions to those that existed prior to 2011. The deposit reduces the amount of flow that travels down the side channel. Until the deposit is rebuilt by the river, the main channel might have a slightly lower water line (lower stage height) during low flows than currently. This is not expected to be significant, but without a cross-sectional survey of the river bed, it cannot be quantified.

Cumulative Effects: The Colorado River is a dynamic system that continually is depositing and eroding sediments. The upstream diversions and land uses also contribute to the evolving hydrology of the river. The proposed action is a small addition to this process, and would primarily affect the immediate area. If the river is trying to fill the side channel, then the Proposed Action delays that occurring. As peak flows are expected to decrease due to upstream firming projects, the side channel may remain open for some time.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:

Direct and Indirect Effects: Under the No Action Alternative, the deposit would not be used to maintain the boat ramp.

Cumulative Effects: Depending on the river's peak flows over the next several years, the deposit might continue to grow or be removed and redeposited downstream. The river might deposit or erode along Mr. Leroux's property, making more or less difficult to pump water to his irrigated fields. The expected yearly peak flows are expected to be reduced due to the upstream firming projects.

Mitigation: None

RECREATION

Affected Environment: The Proposed Action is within the Upper Colorado River Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). The recreation site is used primarily by river rafters, anglers, and campers. Approximately 45,000 visitors use the site annually. The site is the one of the most heavily used river accesses along the Upper Colorado River. The season of use at the site is generally Memorial Day through Labor Day. Currently, there is only one launch site with one ramp at the Radium Recreation Site. Use data collected by the BLM Kremmling Field Office suggests 75% of trips on the Upper Colorado River from Pumphouse to State Bridge put in at Pumphouse and take out at Radium.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:

Direct and Indirect Effects: The maintenance operations would create short-term impacts to users at the site. The proposed improvements would improve the access to the boat launch during periods of low water and solve the problem of the drop off at the edge of the launch which impacted trailers and vehicles.

Cumulative Effects: None

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:

Direct and Indirect Effects: The maintenance operations would not create short-term impacts to users at the site. The proposed improvements would not improve the access to the boat launch during periods of low water and would not solve the problem of the drop off at the edge of the launch which impacts trailers and vehicles.

Cumulative Effects: None

Mitigation: None

REFERENCES CITED: None

TRIBES, INDIVIDUALS, ORGANIZATIONS, OR AGENCIES CONSULTED:

Northern Ute Tribe (Uinta & Ouray Tribal Business Committee):

Irene Cuch, Chairman
Besy Chapoose, NAGPRA Representative

Ute Mountain Ute Tribe:

Gary Hayes, Chairman
Terry Knight, Sr., NAGPRA Representative/THPO
Lynn Hartman, Contract Administrator

Southern Ute Tribe:

Jimmy Newton, Jr., Chairman
Alden B. Naranjo, NAGPRA Coordinator

Eastern Shoshone Tribe (Shoshone Business Council):

Mike LaJeunesse, Chairman
Wilford Ferris III, THPO

Northern Arapaho Tribe (Northern Arapaho Business Council):

Jim Shakespeare, Chairman
Darlene Conrad, NAGPRA Representative

Colorado Commission of Indian Affairs:

Ernest House Jr., Executive Secretary

Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife:

Jon Ewert, Division Fisheries Biologist

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

Name	Title	Area of Responsibility	Date Signed
Paula Belcher	Hydrologist	Air Quality; Surface and Ground Water Quality; Floodplains, Hydrology, and Water Rights; Soils; Wetland and Riparian Zones	05/2/2013
Bill B. Wyatt	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources; Native American Religious Concerns; Paleontological Resources	03/14/2013
Cynthia Landing	Rangeland Management Specialist	Vegetation; Rangeland Management	03/26/2013
Megan McGuire	Wildlife Biologist	Migratory Birds; Special Status Plant and Animal Species; Terrestrial and Aquatic Wildlife; Areas of Critical Environmental Concern;	03/25/2013
Zach Hughes	Natural Resource specialist	Invasive, non-native species; Vegetation	04/09/2013
Kelly Elliott	Natural Resource Specialist	Hazardous or Solid Wastes; Geology and Minerals	4/29/2013
John Monkouski	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Wilderness; Access and Transportation	5/2/2013
Kenneth Belcher	Forester	Forest Management	04/02/2013
Kevin Thompson	Fire Management Specialist	Fire Management	3/25/2013
Annie Sperandio	Realty Specialist	Realty	3/27/2013
Hannah Schechter	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Project Lead – Document Preparer; Recreation; Wild and Scenic Rivers;	03/21/2013

Name	Title	Area of Responsibility	Date Signed
		Visual Resources	
Susan Cassel	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	NEPA Compliance	5/1/2013

ATTACHMENTS:

Figure 1: Map of the Project



**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Kremmling Field Office,
P O Box 68
Kremmling, CO 80459**

**Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)
DOI-BLM-CON02000-2013-0024-EA**

BACKGROUND

During high flow years, sediment builds up in the channel of the Colorado River leading to the boat ramp at the Radium Boat Launch. During low water years boats cannot access the ramp because there is no water flowing near the ramp. Over the past 14 years, since the ramp was built, gravel from the bottom of the existing boat ramp has been washed away creating a drop-off of about two feet. Sediment needs to be removed from the gravel bar and redeposited at the end of the boat launch.

BLM is also proposing to maintain the existing ramp by removing the sandbar of accumulated sediment out of the channel leading to the boat ramp and use those materials to build up the river bed at the existing ramp.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Based upon a review of the EA and the supporting documents, I have determined that the Proposed Action is not a major federal action and will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, individually or cumulatively with other actions in the general area. No environmental effects meet the definition of significance in context or intensity, as defined at 40 CFR 1508.27 and do not exceed those effects as described in the in Kremmling Resource Management Plan (RMP), Record of Decision (ROD) December 19, 1984; Updated February 1999. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not required. This finding is based on the context and intensity of the project as described below.

Context

The project is a site-specific action directly involving BLM administered public lands that do not in and of itself have international, national, regional, or state-wide importance. This project directly involves the BLM and no other parties are involved.

Intensity

The following discussion is organized around the 10 Significance Criteria described at 40 CFR 1508.27. The following have been considered in evaluating intensity for this Proposed Action:

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.

2. The degree to which the Proposed Action affects public health or safety.

There would be no impact to public health and safety.

3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

There are no unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, or ecologically critical areas. The Colorado River has been determined to be eligible to be designated as a wild and scenic river but this action would not affect the ORV's.

4. Degree to which the possible effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.

The effects on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be highly controversial.

5. Degree to which the possible effects on the quality of the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risk.

No highly uncertain or unknown risks to the human environment were identified during analysis of the Proposed Action.

6. Degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

The Proposed Action neither establishes a precedent for future BLM actions with significant effects nor represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.

This action is not related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.

8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed on the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

There are no affected district, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed on the National Register of Historic Places and would not cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

9. The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973.

This action would not adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973.

10. Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

Neither the Proposed Action nor impacts associated with it violate any laws or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: _____/s/ Susan Cassel_____
Field Manager

DATE SIGNED: 5-2-13

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Kremmling Field Office,
P O Box 68
Kremmling, CO 80459**

DECISION RECORD

PROJECT NAME: Radium Boat Launch Maintenance

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NUMBER: DOI-BLM-LLCON02000-2013-0024-EA

DECISION

It is my decision to implement the Proposed Action, as mitigated in DOI-BLM-CO-2013-0024-EA, authorizing maintenance of the Radium boat launch by removing the gravel from the middle of the Colorado River and redepositing at the end of the boat ramp to repair the drop off.

Mitigation Measures: None

COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS & CONFORMANCE WITH THE LAND USE PLAN

This decision is in compliance with the Federal Land Management and Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the National Historic Preservation Act. It is also in conformance with the December 19, 1984; Updated February 1999 Kremmling Resource Management Plan (RMP).

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The Proposed Action was analyzed in DOI-BLM-CO-2013-0024-EA and it was found to have no significant impacts, thus an EIS is not required.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT: Internal scoping occurred March 4, 2013. External scoping occurred March 21, 2013 and notices were in various newspapers within a weeks time. Only one comment was received from a local landowner about the maintenance on the Radium boat launch. His concerns were answered by the BLM Hydrologist.

RATIONALE

Analysis of the Proposed Action has concluded that there are no significant negative impacts and that it meets Colorado Standards for Public Land Health. The maintenance on the boat launch will improve the access to the ramp from the river and also improve the ramp by removing the drop off.

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

Administrative remedies may be available to those who believe they will be adversely affected by this decision. Appeals may be made to the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Interior, Board of Land Appeals (Board) in strict compliance with the regulations in 43 CFR Part 4. Notices of appeal must be filed in this office within 30 days after publication of this decision. If a notice of appeal does not include a statement of reasons,

such statement must be filed with this office and the Board within 30 days after the notice of appeal is filed. The notice of appeal and any statement of reasons, written arguments, or briefs must also be served upon the Regional Solicitor, Rocky Mountain Region, U.S. Department of Interior, 755 Parfet Street, Suite 151, Lakewood, CO 80215.

The effective date of this decision (and the date initiating the appeal period) will be the date this notice of decision is posted on BLM's Kremmling Field Office internet website.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: ____/s/ Susan Cassel_____
Field Manager

DATE SIGNED: 5/2/13